

single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application. The conventional random access process has been performed based on the TDMA scheme and on the premise that delivery and confirmation are made for each data frame with bidirectional communication. Thus, in the conventional technique, continuous transmission of a plurality of data frames has been realized without difficulty.

Unlike the conventional technique, the present invention adopts the FDMA scheme utilizing unidirectional communication, and it is the objective of the present invention to provide a random access technique, which allows a plurality of data frames to be transmitted in the FDMA scheme and which realizes characteristics of few collisions and high throughput.

The following technical features of the present invention are believed to be unique over the prior art of record. For example, claim 1 recites the following features:

(1) a predetermined offset time is set between downstream communication frames from the base station to each mobile station and upstream communication frames from the mobile station to the base station;

(2) the base station transmits a transmission permission signal for permitting transmission of one frame of data when a particular one of the upstream communication frames is available, determines whether or not continuous transmission of subsequent data over a plurality of frames should be permitted if the subsequent data exists subsequently to the one frame of data received through the particular frame from one of the mobile stations, and transmits a continuous transmission permission signal for permission of the continuous transmission when the continuous transmission is permitted; and

(3) if each mobile station has data to be transmitted, it transmits one frame of data in response to the transmission permission signal from the base station, and transmits the subsequent data through a plurality of consecutive frames in the upstream communication frames when receiving the continuous transmission permission signal with respect to the transmitted one frame of data.

Dependent claim 2 further recites a predetermined time period longer than one frame. Regarding feature (3), continuous data frames are transmitted without making any confirmation mid-course. Independent claims 11-15 recite similar features.

For the reasons provided below, the Applicant respectfully submits that Sanderford does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

Rather than presenting an element-by-element analysis of the features of the present claims, the Official Action generally and broadly asserts the following (pages 2-3, Paper No. 20080922):

... SANDERFORD teaches a mobile communication system/method in which a base station and mobile stations perform communication by a slotted-ALOHA method, the system being characterized in that a predetermined offset time is set between downstream communication frames from the base station to each mobile station and upstream communication frames from the mobile station to the base station (0122, 0130);

The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the assertions in the Official Action. Sanderford teaches away from the features of the present invention. In fact, Sanderford fails to teach a predetermined offset time which is set between the base station's communication frames and the mobile station's communication frames.

Also, the Official Action generally and broadly asserts the following (page 3, Paper No. 20080922):

the base station transmits a transmission permission signal for permitting transmission of one frame of data when a particular one of the upstream communication frames is available, determines whether or not continuous transmission of subsequent data over a plurality of frames should be permitted if the subsequent data exists subsequently to the one frame of data received through the particular frame from one of the mobile stations, and transmits a continuous transmission permission signal for permission of the continuous transmission when the continuous transmission is permitted (0122);

The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the assertions in the Official Action. It is clear that Sanderford fails to teach that the base station transmits two kinds of permission signals: a transmission permission signal for permitting transmission of one data frame; and a continuous transmission permission signal for permitting the continuous transmission of a plurality of subsequent data frames.

Further, the Official Action generally and broadly asserts the following (page 3, Paper No. 20080922):

if each mobile station has data to be transmitted, it transmits one frame of data in response to the transmission permission signal from the base station, and transmits the subsequent data through a plurality of consecutive frames in the upstream communication frames when receiving the continuous transmission permission signal with respect to the transmitted one frame of data (0130, 0140, 0196).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the assertions in the Official Action. It is clear that Sanderford fails to teach the present invention's feature "each mobile station transmits the subsequent data through a plurality of continuous frames when receiving the continuous transmission permission signal from the base station."

Therefore, contrary to the assertions in the Official Action, paragraphs [0122], [0130], [0140] and [0196] of Sanderford, and Sanderford as a whole, do not, in fact, teach at least the above-referenced features (1), (2) and (3), either explicitly or inherently.

Since Sanderford does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

Further, it is noted that a related Japanese application containing claims 1-15 that are similar to claims 1-15 of the present application issued as a patent. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the allowability of the claims in the JP application is a further indication of the patentability of the present claims over Sanderford.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789